



# Center for the Evangelical United Brethren Heritage

## TELESCOPE-MESSENGER

United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio

Vol. 21 No. 1

Winter 2011

### Thomas Coke Carter—The Southern Hope

by

Robert L. Frey

Thomas Coke Carter was one of the few United Brethren bishops who did not enter the ministry and receive his ordination in the UB church—and therein lies an interesting tale.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Carter was born into a devout Christian family that included seven brothers on January 1, 1851. Reuben E. Carter, his father, was born in South Carolina but moved to western Tennessee in the 1840s where he acquired a large tract of land. Here he met and later married Sarah Herron, a neighbor. Thomas Coke Carter had an identical twin named Joseph McKendree Carter and by their middle names one can correctly surmise that the family belonged to the Methodist Episcopal Church (M.E.).<sup>2</sup>

As he grew into a young man Thomas and his brothers were given instruction in Christian living by their parents. Since the farm acquired by Reuben Carter was large for that day, all of the sons were regularly engaged in helping to work the farm—a practical form of education to be sure. But formal education was a major deficiency in rural western Tennessee. The best the Carter boys could enjoy were infrequent sessions in “subscription” schools,<sup>3</sup> that usually met less than three months a year. Despite the inadequate schooling Thomas proved to be a voracious learner.

When Thomas was older his father was able to hire John McLeod to tutor him. McLeod was a better prepared teacher than Thomas encountered in the subscription schools and later he gave Mr. McLeod credit for teaching him mastery of the English language. Since McLeod lived at some distance from the Carter house, it required a considerable walk for Thomas each day. This had to be accomplished while he also completed his agricultural chores.

At the age of 15, Thomas and his brother, James, accepted Christ during a revival at the Methodist church. Thomas was at first reluctant to go to the altar, but on the urging of a cousin he eventually followed his brother. From that point on Thomas involved himself as much as possible in the local church and in the process felt a call to Christian ministry. When he told his father of his call his father expressed great joy and confided in Thomas that such a decision had been the wish of both of his parents. With such support Thomas preached his first sermon at the age of 17 and at the age of 18 (October 1869) was accepted into the Tennessee Conference of the M.E. Church.

The young Rev. Carter’s charge was a good distance from home. His father gave him a horse and saddle and he set out with some trepidation. Arriving at his appointment, he was able to find free lodging with Mr. William Powell and his family. While living there he frequently conducted family worship and tutored the young boys of the family. His pastoral work met with success. More than 100 people were converted by the preaching of the zealous and earnest young preacher. One of these converts, Maggie Brown, eventually became his wife.

It did not take Thomas long to conclude that he needed more formal education. Thus after one year on the circuit he was granted permission by the conference to enroll at East Tennessee Wesleyan University. He studied there for four years, but then transferred to DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. For at least part of these five years he earned his way by working as a janitor.<sup>4</sup> He earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from DePauw in the spring of 1875. By all accounts, Thomas was an excellent student and later in life was credited with brilliant intellectual faculties.<sup>5</sup>

After graduation Rev. Carter was hired as the principal of West Tennessee Seminary<sup>6</sup> for one year. During this time he married Maggie Brown (December 26, 1875) and had numerous opportunities to perfect his preaching style. As the 1875-1876 year came to a close, Thomas was offered the presidency of Tullahoma College and the pastorate of the college Methodist Episcopal church. Thus at the age of 25 he became a college president! For the next four years he immersed himself in both his role as college president and as pastor. His travels on behalf of the college extended his oratorical fame throughout the area and he appeared to be an effective collegiate administrator as well. At the college church he was also highly regarded.

At one of the annual conferences during his years as president, Rev. Carter preached the missionary sermon. The presiding bishop was so impressed he offered Carter the position of superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal mission schools in central China.<sup>7</sup> On May 3, 1880, along with his wife and young daughter, the family set sail for China. Little is known about the reason for this pull to missionary service, although it was not uncommon as the following story on Rev. W.J. Shuey shows. Like Shuey, Carter’s missionary career ended because of illness. In the case of Thomas, it appeared as if the illness would be fatal.

After 14 days of unconsciousness, he was rushed aboard a ship with little hope that he would survive the journey home. But he did. After a period of recuperation, he was able to return to service.

Once again Rev. Carter's career changed direction—this time as the editor of the *Methodist Advocate* published in Atlanta, Georgia. Over the years he had contributed many articles to the publication. Thus his name was well known to many readers. It made him a good fit for the position of editor.<sup>8</sup> Thomas was not anxious to move to Atlanta and persuaded the denomination to move the editorial office to Chattanooga, Tennessee. It must be mentioned at this point that Thomas was a member of the northern ME church. Thus he was publishing a paper for the northern Methodists in the home territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. To imagine that this was awkward and resulted in significant controversies for the young editor is an understatement!

In 1884, 1888, and 1892 Rev. Carter was a delegate to the General Conference sessions of the ME Church. At all three of these sessions he was re-elected editor of the *Advocate*. At the 1892 Conference, however, two events changed his life. For some time Carter had been uncomfortable with the lack of democracy within the ME denomination. Along with a number of similarly minded delegates, primarily from the south, a resolution was introduced to create more democracy by electing district superintendents, by removing time limits from pastorates, by admitting women as members of the General Conference, and by several other changes.<sup>9</sup> The resolution was defeated and Carter was greatly disappointed—disillusioned might be a better word.

At the same conference Dr. William Beardshear, representing the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, brought fraternal greetings and addressed the Conference. Dr. Carter<sup>10</sup> was impressed with Dr. Beardshear's representation of the United Brethren Church and began to consider if it might be a more hospitable denomination for his work. He was not alone. Other pastors, perhaps as many as two dozen from the Tennessee area, were similarly disaffected by the M.E. system. Word of this dissatisfaction reached the United Brethren in Dayton. At a July 17, 1894, meeting of UB ministers, the following resolution was adopted: "Resolved that we learned with no small degree of interest of advances toward union with our church on the part of a large number of evangelical Christians in Tennessee, North Carolina, and adjacent states."<sup>11</sup> The proposal further stated a willingness to encourage such union by sending representatives to meet with those interested in joining the United Brethren. Drury identified

Thomas Carter as a leader of those leaning toward the UB.<sup>12</sup>

Meanwhile, shortly after the conclusion of the 1892 General Conference, Rev. Carter resigned as editor of the *Advocate*. This was done amicably with a promise to aid any who followed him and to fulfill any commitments he had made at that time. There is no reason to believe that he did not do so, but no information can be found about what he did for the next two years. In November, 1894, Rev. Thomas Carter was received into the United Brethren Church by Rev. S. S. Holden, presiding elder, of the Tennessee Conference. Those in attendance at this event included Rev. William J. Shuey, who probably represented clergy from the Dayton area as well as the larger denomination.

Between 20 and 24 ministers joined Thomas Carter in coming into the United Brethren denomination from the ME and some lay people also followed.<sup>13</sup> With this encouraging start, and with strong encouragement from Rev. Shuey, Dr. Carter was appointed superintendent of advance work in the south by the Board of Missions. In this role Dr. Carter was to travel the entire area, conducting revivals, directing evangelism efforts, advising clergy, and organizing new classes, congregations, and conferences. Into this effort Dr. Carter threw himself with his customary, energy, intelligence, and eloquence.<sup>14</sup>

For the first decade the results were encouraging, although perhaps not as much as some United Brethren leaders hoped. Nonetheless, at the 1905 General Conference session of The Church of the United Brethren in Christ held in Topeka, Kansas, a Southern District was created and Dr. Carter was elected its bishop. For reasons that are not entirely clear, in the years following the election of Bishop Carter the efforts to create and enlarge UB churches in the Southern District atrophied. Among some UB, feelings developed that the rest of the denomination had been given an overly favorable picture of prospects in the south.<sup>15</sup> The blame for this "oversell," if, in fact, that was the case, does not seem to have rubbed off on Bishop Carter because in 1909 he was re-elected bishop.

Some reasons for the lack of growth and expansion in the United Brethren can be proposed. The strongest area of the UB in Tennessee was in the eastern part of the state where Union sentiment had been relatively strong. It was not a slave-holding area and attitudes toward slavery were less adamant than they were in other parts of the south. Thus the strong anti-slavery stance and the belief in equality for African-Americans held by the United Brethren was not as much of a problem as was the case in western

Tennessee and other parts of the south where efforts were made to expand the church. Furthermore, the difference between the Methodist and United Brethren churches in polity and theology were not readily apparent to the average layperson in this area. Therefore, it is not surprising that relatively few laypeople followed the disaffected clergy into the United Brethren fold.

In addition, the Methodist churches in the area were not without resources to fight off the United Brethren incursion. Frequent reference to the UB view that African-Americans were equal to Caucasians, to the UB German heritage, and to their northern concentration quickly convinced many potential converts to the United Brethren Church that such a move was not wise. Initially, the strong revivalist appeal of the UB led to increases in the number and strength of United Brethren churches in the area. But by the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century UB revivalism had paled in comparison to the upsurge of Pentecostal and similar movements in the area. Thus, it was no surprise that at the 1913 General Conference the United Brethren dissolved the Southern District and elected Bishop Carter to emeritus status without salary. He was 62 at the time.

The decision concerning Bishop Carter at the 1913 General Conference must have been awkward indeed. There is clear evidence that he was highly esteemed among the leaders of the denomination. But what do with him? Three bishoprics were available in 1913, but with little support outside of the southern area of the United Brethren Church there was no indication Carter was considered for any of them. Instead, Rev. Henry H. Fout, Rev. Alfred T. Howard, and Rev. Cyrus J. Kephart were elected to fill those vacancies. So it was that Bishop Carter left the 1913 Conference with a title and nothing else.

Because of his preaching ability, however, Bishop Carter did not long for things to do. He received numerous invitations and was kept busy traveling throughout the denomination preaching and lecturing. His lectures on China were frequently cited as among his best. He was well received at every stop, and he was still able to arrange for time to be at home in Chattanooga with his wife. Early in 1916 while returning from speaking engagements in northeastern Ohio, Bishop Carter decided to stay overnight in Cincinnati. He checked into a hotel on the evening of February 19<sup>th</sup> and shortly thereafter left the hotel for an evening walk. During this walk two men accosted him, beat him severely (probably with brass knuckles), and robbed him of his money, but not his watch and some other valuables.<sup>16</sup>

Bishop Carter was able to return to the hotel, and his injuries were not discovered until attempts were

made to clean his room the following day. When examined, his left eyeball was entirely out of the socket and hanging only by a small ligament. Other symptoms indicated a severe concussion with significant internal bleeding as well as several deep lacerations. He was removed to the home of Dr. A.F. Snell, a medical doctor and an old Tennessee friend, where he lingered until he died at 1 a.m. on Sunday, February 27, 1916. The cause of death was announced as an attack of malignant erysipelas, a superficial cellulitis caused by Group A  $\beta$ -hemolytic streptococci or a "strep" infection. Not serious today, but in an age before antibiotics it could be fatal.

When asked why he did not report the assault immediately, Bishop Carter said he did not want a newspaper account of his misfortune to concern his wife who was ill, and he did not want to incur the notoriety such a report might generate. It was the opinion of Joseph M. Phillippi, the editor of the *Religious Telescope*, that such modesty probably cost the Bishop his life. "Had a physician been consulted at once, the disease which proved fatal might not have developed."<sup>17</sup>

His death, however, was the cause of a great deal of shock and confusion. In the Dayton area it was initially announced by Rev. Ira D. Warner, pastor of the Oak Street UB Church, at the morning service. He indicated only that the death was the result of an infection. As pastor of First UB Church, Chattanooga, Warner had been pastor to the Carter family for several years. He was notified of the Bishop's death by Ethel, his surviving daughter (his other daughter died 11 years earlier). She not only notified Rev. Warner of her father's death, but requested help from his Dayton friends to make the necessary arrangements to care for the body and to arrange for the funeral.

The announcement of the Bishop's death was made in other Dayton churches. As the day progressed and early the next morning Bishop George M. Mathews, Colonel Robert Cowden (described as a close personal friend), and denominational treasurer, L.O. Miller, along with Rev. Warner, went to Cincinnati to assist Ethel. The actual facts surrounding Bishop Carter's death came via an Associated Press story from Cincinnati and, as the nature of the crime that felled Bishop Carter became known, caused much concern from many United Brethren. The editor of the *Religious Telescope* recalled a similar incident that felled Bishop Nicholas Castle in Chicago. Although Bishop Castle was injured, his injuries were not fatal.<sup>18</sup> With the help of friends, Bishop Carter's body was removed to Chattanooga, accompanied by his daughter and Colonel Cowden.



Bishop Carter's funeral was held at the First Baptist Church of Chattanooga because it was feared the First UB Church could not hold the crowd. A distinguished group attended the ceremony held at 3 p.m., rather late in the day, to accommodate citizens of the city. It was said the audience ". . . represented the intelligent, cultured citizenship of Chattanooga."<sup>19</sup> Bishop George Mathews was in charge of the service, assisted by Rev. A.O. Wright, pastor of First UB Church, Chattanooga, and Dr. Powell, pastor of the host church. Official representatives from the general church were Bishop Mathews, Bishop Kephart, Col. Cowden, and General Treasurer, L.O. Miller, who was instructed to pay all of the expenses of the funeral on behalf of the denomination.

Bishop Mathews preached the sermon and said of Bishop Carter that he was a man of unusual intellectual power, a perfect gentleman, a gifted orator, a man who possessed great heart power (was a passionate advocate for Christ and a committed family man), a man distinguished in his knowledge and acquaintance of great men and leaders, and best of all, a Christian.<sup>20</sup> Bishop Kephart, Dr. S. W. Paul, superintendent of the East Tennessee Conference, and Col. Robert Cowden also recounted their memories of Bishop Carter. Aside from the Bishop's wife and daughter, his twin brother Rev. James M. Carter, superintendent of the Arkansas Methodist conference, and his daughter were the only relatives present.

The editor of the *Religious Telescope* made the final summary of Bishop Carter's life and it was indeed an eloquent one. "To begin with, he [Bishop Carter] was well educated. Moreover, he was intellectually strong. His mind was not only well developed and trained, but his intellectual faculties were brilliant. He had also an eloquent tongue—a great gift of speech—in the use of which he became potent in the pulpit, popular on the rostrum, and persuasive in the counsels of the Church. In the use of the pen he was also greatly gifted. As a journalist, his editorials were of a high order, showing skill in composition and wide acquaintance with language and literature. His paragraphs were pointed, his sentences finished, his periods complete and well rounded."<sup>21</sup>

The editorial went on to say that "Bishop Carter was intensely patriotic, a lover of his native Southland, and a loyal churchman—a man finely grained in genuine courtesy and kindness. The influence of these affectionate traits holds the qualities that remain, both with him and with us, and constitute the basis of this appreciation. They won for him a wide circle of ardent, stalwart friends in all circles of society, from the humblest to the highest, and held them to the day of his death. They were with him in joy and in sorrow, in prosperity and in adversity, and many of them were present at his funeral. They will always love him. So will we. Peace to his ashes!"<sup>22</sup>

As a postscript, a final story can be told. Both ministerial brothers, Thomas and James, so closely resembled each other, dressing alike and trimming their beards in the same manner, that close friends had difficulty telling them apart. As it turned out so did animals. On

returning to the Carter home after the funeral, brother James Carter was greeted enthusiastically by the three household pets. They jumped around and showed evidence of greeting the master home from a trip. After a moment James said to them, "You are mistaken, your master lies out in the cemetery now."<sup>23</sup>

1. A.W. Drury, *History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ* (United Brethren Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio, 1931), 536.
2. Paul R. Koontz and Walter E. Roush, *The Bishops: Church of the United Brethren in Christ* (The Otterbein Press, Dayton, Ohio, 1950), 184. Much of the basic material on the life of Bishop Carter comes from this source, specifically, pages 184-194.
3. Subscription schools resulted when parents joined together and agreed to pay a certain fee to hire a teacher. The process of hiring was not sophisticated with the result that many of the teachers were inadequate. Furthermore, the process had to be repeated year after year as the sums subscribed were rarely adequate to retain a teacher for long.
4. Henry A. Thompson, *Our Bishops* (UB Publishing House, Dayton, 1906), 713. This heroic description of Carter's life has more information than Koontz and Roush, but with no documentation.
5. *Religious Telescope*, March 8, 1916 (Volume 82, No. 10), 4.
6. The term "seminary" frequently referred to a high school with some collegiate-level coursework. Such was the case with West Tennessee Seminary.
7. Thompson, 714.
8. *Ibid.*, 716.
9. *Ibid.*, 718.
10. East Tennessee Wesleyan University granted the Doctor of Divinity degree to Thomas Carter in 1884.
11. Drury, 536.
12. Drury, 746.
13. There is disagreement about the number of clergy who came to the UB. Daniel Berger in *The Church of the United Brethren in Christ* (The Otterbein Press, Dayton, Ohio, 1914), 614, puts the number at 25. John H. Ness, Jr. in *One Hundred Fifty Years: A History of Publishing in the Evangelical United Brethren Church* (Otterbein Press, Dayton, 1966), 391, puts the number at 21. Both include Carter in that number.
14. Koontz & Roush, 193.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Religious Telescope*, March 8, 1916, 3. Most of the remaining discussion of Bishop Carter's death comes from this issue of the *Religious Telescope*, 3-7.
17. *Ibid.*, 3.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, 6.
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*, 4.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, 7.

## Rev. William J. Shuey: Forgotten Leader (Part II)

by  
Robert L. Frey

*As mentioned in the previous number of the Telescope-Messenger, this article was based on material in the March 6, 1920, issue of The Religious Telescope. Parenthetical numbers within the text refer to the page of the March 6, 1920 issue.*

During Rev. William J. Shuey's pastorate in Cincinnati (1851-1854) he became interested in missionary work in Sierra Leone, West Africa. The major impetus for this interest was related to the famous Amistad case. As moderate abolitionists, the United Brethren were aware of this case in which people from Sierra Leone were taken into slavery, but were intercepted by an American ship and were held in Connecticut until released by the U.S. government after a landmark trial. The remnants of the group returned to their home in 1842 along with missionaries from the American Missionary Society of the Congregational Church.

In 1854 Rev. Shuey felt strongly enough about an effort to establish a missionary witness in Sierra Leone to offer himself to the Board of Missions. He was accepted and for several months he traveled to many United Brethren churches in an effort to gain support for the mission. In January, 1855, Shuey, Dr. D. C. Kumler, and Rev. D. K. Flickinger set sail for Sierra Leone. They set up a mission close to the American Missionary Society mission. Neither efforts fared well. Indeed, eventually the AMA gave up its mission and turned the field over to the United Brethren.

Rev. Shuey remained in Sierra Leone for seven months and during most of that time he was incapacitated by the heat and the diseases native to that part of the world, but relatively unknown in Ohio. The mission hung by a "shoestring" as over 100 missionaries died in the field during the first 25 years of its existence. With the appointment of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Gomer, African-Americans who were members of 3<sup>rd</sup> U.B. Church in Dayton, Ohio, to the mission in Sierra Leone, it not only survived but today has a membership of about 85,000.<sup>1</sup>

On his return from Africa, Rev. Shuey served First Church in Cincinnati from 1856 to 1859 and again in 1862 and 1863. From 1859 to 1861 he was pastor of First United Brethren Church in Dayton, Ohio. During the first year in Dayton he reported 104 members added "many of them young men of promise."<sup>6</sup> In 1862 Shuey was elected presiding elder (district superintendent) of the Dayton district.

But Rev. Shuey did not serve as a presiding elder for long. In April, 1864, he was elected to the position of Publishing Agent for the United Brethren denomination. It was a position he was to hold for 33 years during which time he rendered invaluable service to the church. A. W. Drury said of Rev. Shuey's service: "More than any bishop, editor, or other church leader, Mr. Shuey, in his position as Publishing Agent, was for an entire generation the strategic center for the activities and progress of the United Brethren Church."<sup>2</sup>

Drury and others give Shuey credit for stabilizing and strengthening the publishing house and publishing activities of the denomination. During Shuey's tenure the net assets of the publishing house increased from \$11,000 to \$322,000. Because of his business acumen the credit of the house was strengthened to the point where it had great credibility with the business leaders of the Dayton area—a condition not always present in the history of the United Brethren Church. Dr. John Ness, Jr., the author of the history of publishing in the Evangelical United Brethren Church says: "Although he was fairly conservative as an executive, Shuey displayed enough progressive spirit in his management to enlarge property and equipment compatible with the growth of the respective departments of the business. As the Publishing Agent he developed the Printing Establishment as the strategic center around which much of the activity and progress of the United Brethren in Christ revolved."<sup>3</sup>

During his years as Publishing Agent, Rev. Shuey never missed a session of the Miami Annual Conference and was a delegate to all of the General Conferences in that time span. Indeed he was editor of the General Conference minutes from 1865 to 1893 and edited the Year Book of the United Brethren Church for many years. He was a member of the General Board of Trustees of the denomination, one of the first directors of the Church Erection Society, and from its organization the superintendent and later the treasurer of the General Sabbath-School Association. He also served for 26 years on the Board of Missions and for four years on the Board of [Christian] Education.

Rev. Shuey was active within the Dayton religious community as well. He served as president of the Dayton United Brethren Ministers Association, as trustee for 40 years of First Church, and was a member of the Montgomery County Bible society. Beyond the religious community he was a director of the Fourth National Bank for 27 years, a director of the Associated Charities, vice-president of the Union Safe Deposit and Trust Company, and director and vice-president of the Miami Valley Hospital. He also served on the Dayton Board of Trade and on the Board of Education. In the latter position he was instrumental in assigning the first women as school principals. These positions give clear evidence of the respect in which the church and the community held him.

Special mention must be given to Rev. Shuey's efforts on behalf of education. Despite the fact that his formal education was modest, he was a staunch supporter of college and seminary education. For 22 years he was a trustee of Otterbein University and for seven years was a member of its executive committee. But his role in the

founding of the United Brethren seminary was his most impressive contribution to religious education.

It was Dr. Shuey<sup>4</sup> who at the General Conference of 1869 introduced the motion that led to the founding of Union Biblical Institute (later Bonebrake and today United Theological Seminary). He eloquently defended the idea of a seminary despite the fact that strong opposition existed to “preacher factories” within the denomination. He and colleagues like Rev. Milton Wright, the father of the Wright Brothers of aviation fame, carried the day. Later Rev. Shuey and Rev. Wright were to part ways in the denominational split of 1889. Dr. Shuey was on the first executive committee of the seminary and after being voted out as Publishing Agent in 1897 was elected business manager of Bonebrake Theological Seminary for the following quadrennium. Of his contributions to education, J. P. Landis, President of the Seminary wrote: “Who can estimate the influence for moral, religious, and intellectual development which this leader of our Church forces has, under God, been the means of achieving? All honor to the intelligent, uplifting, progressive career of this servant of the Church and of God.”(10)

Perhaps the most difficult period of Dr. Shuey’s life came as a result of the division of the Church in 1889. As a member of the Commission on Revision of the Confession of Faith and Amendment of the Constitution of the Church, Dr. Shuey was a major figure in the controversy that led to the split between the Liberals (the majority) and the Radicals (the minority). Shortly after Bishop Wright and his supporters withdrew from the General Conference of 1889, they attempted to take possession of the publishing house in Dayton. This, of course, led to a legal battle that was not finally concluded until 1897. During this time Shuey was in the middle of this battle and others that raged over the control of local church properties. He hired and instructed the numerous lawyers necessary to fight off the challenges of the Radicals. In the process he developed enemies, not only among the Radicals, but among the Liberals as well.

Thus perhaps it was not a total surprise that at the General Conference of 1897 when the ballots were counted for Publishing Agent, William R. Funk, who had no experience in the publishing business, had 115 votes to Shuey’s 64. When Shuey was defeated for the position of missionary treasurer, a position in which he had no interest, there was a round of applause (unusual for United Brethren). Although Shuey was later elected business manager for Bonebrake Seminary, he was discouraged with the applause at his defeat. He concluded a statement to the General Conference by saying: “. . . this [the applause] is an indication to me that the church has not very much more for me to do.”<sup>5</sup> Later the General Conference, perhaps in an attempt to mend the relationship with Dr. Shuey, passed a special resolution recognizing his impressive efforts for the publishing mission of the denomination and for his defense of the property of the Liberals.<sup>6</sup>

At this late date it is difficult to understand the “politics” at play in Shuey’s defeat. The standard explanation is that his conservative financial management

style and lack of a grand vision was seen as old fashioned by many members of the Conference. They wanted change and some young blood (after all Shuey was 70 years old).<sup>7</sup> It is probable that in the minds of some delegates Shuey’s hard driving defense of the property rights of the Liberals and his involvement with the legal profession had caused him to take his eye off of the publishing interests of the denomination. And he had made enemies in the process. It was probably a combination of factors that caused his defeat.

In any event, despite the special resolution, Dr. Shuey’s repudiation at the hands of his friends and colleagues in the 1897 General Conference demoralized him. This can be seen in the following passage from an autographical statement he wrote about 1900: “During the fifty years of my active life in the Church, I participated perhaps too readily and eagerly in the discussions and settlement of the great questions which arose and touched the very life of the Church. The first was the depravity question in 1853-57, which threatened the cleaving of the body in sunder. This was compromised and forever quieted by the General Conference of 1857—the first of which I was a member. The lay delegation matter was a live question then. I advocated it as best I could. Years after, it triumphed, though imperfectly. The instrumental music question gave the Church much trouble. The slavery and secret society questions never would down. Only the Civil war settled the former, and the revision of the constitution of the Church the latter. I had decided convictions on all these matters, and never hesitated to express them, however feebly, on every proper occasion. I do not claim to have been right always. Indeed, the longer I live the less useful my life appears to me. In fact, it looks more and more like a failure. The chief consolation I have is in the thought that I ever did the best I could. I do not see what more I could have done with the light I had. Others must judge as to the value of my unworthy life.”(6)

Some of the perceived unworthiness of his life expressed by Dr. Shuey in this autobiographical statement might be traceable to the “assertive humility” Dr. James Nelson has noted in the EUB tradition.<sup>8</sup> But most of it probably came from the weariness that followed the difficult and protracted fight resulting from the denominational split of 1889 and his defeats at the General Conference of 1897.

As it turned out William Funk’s optimistic vision and grand plans for the publishing establishment almost drove the enterprise on the rocks of financial ruin in the following years. Ness claims that part of the cause of this turn of events was beyond Funk’s control. And it is clear that Funk was aware of the animosity that resulted in his election. He attempted to overcome it and develop pleasant relations with Dr. Shuey. His position was strengthened by the fact that the Board of Publications had many new members thus ensuring their loyalty to Funk.<sup>9</sup> Some of the difficulties encountered by the publishing arm of the church were related to Funk’s lack of experience, but he did work hard to learn the business. By the time he left the position in 1933, William Funk had served as Publishing



Agent for 36 years, three more years than Shuey had served.<sup>10</sup>

For part of the time Dr. Shuey was business manager of the seminary his wife was ill. On the 27<sup>th</sup> of June, 1901, Sarah Shuey died of paralysis. 1901 was the last year Dr. Shuey had any official position in the Church. It is not clear whether Dr. Shuey retired from his position at Bonebrake Seminary before or after his wife's death, or what role Sarah's illness had on his retirement decision. At the time of her death Dr. and Mrs. Shuey had been married for more than 53 years. After Sarah's death, Dr. Shuey continued to live in their house at 35 South Perry Street built in 1882. His son, William Applegate Shuey and his wife, lived with Dr. Shuey for the remainder of his life. But even after 1901, Dr. Shuey continued his church and community involvement in many ways. A.W. Drury reports that "His physical and mental vigor stood out well against the encroachment of age."<sup>11</sup>

Almost a year after Dr. Carter's death, on February 9, 1917, Dr. Shuey celebrated his 90<sup>th</sup> birthday, an unusual occurrence in that day. Clearly he was still remembered. The United Brethren Publishing House ceased operating for an hour as all employees walked the short distance to the South Perry Street house to congratulate Dr. Shuey on reaching such an advanced age. Other members of the United Brethren denomination, reportedly a total of at least 600, stopped by the Perry Street residence to offer their congratulations as well. At one point it was reported that the line of well wishers extended two blocks. As a result of the numerous cards, letters, telegrams, plants, and flowers Dr. Shuey received, he should have revised his gloomy self assessment of his value to his Church and to Dayton. He was remembered and appreciated.

### ***Telescope-Messenger***

Is published twice yearly by the Center  
For the Evangelical United Brethren Heritage  
United Theological Seminary  
4501 Denlinger Road  
Trotwood, OH 45426

Editor: Robert L. Frey  
Compositor: Patricia Frey  
Printer: Mound Printing Co. Inc.

Correspondence should be sent to the editor at  
1356 Hidden Creek Drive  
Miamisburg, OH 45342

Rfrey004@woh.rr.com

When Dr. Shuey died three years later on February 21, 1920, his passing was noted by many with the highest praise. Bishop George M. Mathews said of him "His colossal character rose like a mountain peak, higher and higher, until it touched the heights of life. It was of the granite kind, and stood as a mighty pillar in the Church of his choice."<sup>(8)</sup>

Dr. Shuey and Dr. Thomas Carter, the subject of the first article in this edition, were contemporaries, although Shuey was 24 years older than Carter. They knew and respected, if not admired, each other. Both came from deeply devout Christian families, but William had a greater struggle in heeding the call to ministry. Thomas, on the other hand, made the agonizing decision to forsake the denomination of his family in joining the United Brethren. Both served as missionaries, but saw this service ended by illness. Both served a variety of leadership positions within the church effectively. Of the two, Dr. Shuey must be judged to have had the greater influence on UB history, yet Dr. Carter was well like across the denomination and despite the failure of "the Southern strategy" was a powerful ambassador for Christ. Both are essentially forgotten today, but perhaps not as much after the last two issues of the *Telescope-Messenger*.

1. For more information on the Sierra Leone mission, see J. Bruce Behney & Paul H. Eller, *The History of the Evangelical United Brethren Church* (Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN, 1979), and J. Steven O'Malley, *On the Journey Home: The History of Mission of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, 1946-1968* (General Board of Global Ministries, New York, NY, 2003).

2. A. W. Drury, *History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ* (UB Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio, 1931), 581.

3. John H. Ness, Jr., *One Hundred Fifty Years: A History of Publishing in the Evangelical United Brethren Church* (Otterbein Press, Dayton, 1966), 383.

4. After refusing an honorary doctorate from Hartsville College in 1880, and we know not why, some years later he accepted an honorary doctorate from Otterbein University. Perhaps he accepted the degree because of his role as a trustee and the fact that all three of his sons attended Otterbein and one of them taught on the faculty for a time.

5. Ness, 408.

6. *Ibid*.

7. *Ibid*. 408-409.

8. James D. Nelson "Piety and Hymnody" in Robert L. Frey, ed., *The Making of an American Church* (Scarecrow Press, Lanham, MD., 2007), 157-158.

9 *Ibid*. 410-411.

10. *Ibid*. 499.

11. Drury, p. 581.

United Theological Seminary  
Center for the Evangelical United Brethren Heritage  
4501 Denlinger Road  
Trotwood, OH 45426

NON-PROFIT  
ORGANIZATION  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
DAYTON, OH  
PERMIT NO. 579

## CHANGE SERVICE REQUESTED

### From the Editor

Some misunderstanding developed over the list of EUB missionaries to Nigeria and Sierra Leone, Africa, printed in the last issue of the *Telescope-Messenger*. The list was not intended to be a complete list of missionaries to those countries, but only a "snapshot" of those assigned in early 1962. It omitted those on furlough (leave) or those on special assignment, e.g., those attending graduate programs. My intent was to stimulate recollections on the part of EUB's about these missionaries and, perhaps, to generate some stories from those listed for inclusion in the *Telescope-Messenger*.

But the comments that I received did suggest another topic to me. Some of the missionaries have written books about their experiences in the field. In the last few years five books of this type have come into my hands. Readers of this publication might wish to read one or more of them. They give evidence of the tremendous commitment these people had to spread the love and compassion of Christ to the world.

Dr. Lowell A. Gess's book *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory* (RLE Press, 2002) is a fascinating account of his experiences on the mission field. An ophthalmologist, Dr. Gess served in both Nigeria (the former Evangelical mission) and Sierra Leone (the former United Brethren mission) as well as several other countries. The book's ISBN number is 0-9672527-1-7 and it can be purchased from Central Global Vision, 111 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Alexandria, MN 56308. This book does contain a complete list of the missionaries to both Nigeria and Sierra Leone from 1855 to 2001.

Esther L. Megill, a medical technologist, wrote *Sierra Leone Remembered* (AuthorHouse, Bloomington, IN, 2004). The ISBN

number for the paperback is 1-4184-1419-0 and for the e-book is 1-4184-5549-0. Most book stores will be able to locate a copy of this book with the ISBN number. Lois Olsen, a nurse-midwife, who served in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Kenya, wrote *Contentment is Great Gain* (Leone Press, PO Box 93395, Milwaukee, WI 53203-0395). It has an ISBN number of 0-9654488-00. All three of these books convey the satisfaction, albeit not without struggle and disappointment, of missionary service.

Finally, Gerald Faust, the son of missionaries Arthur and Aletha Faust, sent me copies of two books written by his parents who were missionaries to Nigeria for 40 years. *From Pero Station* is authored by both Arthur and Aletha and was apparently published privately because no publishing data is included. For this reason the book will probably be difficult to locate. It is worth the effort, however, because it is an interesting collection of letters, reports, and articles written by the couple during their years in Africa.

*These Things Have Happened* was written by Aletha Faust and was published by the Evangelical Press at Harrisburg, PA in 1945. Originally published by The Missionary Society and the Women's Missionary Society of the Evangelical Church, it was reprinted in 1986 and 1996, although by whom is unclear. Aletha did general mission work, but concentrated on the schools and reducing the local language to written form. Arthur was a pastor and also taught in pastoral training programs.

Robert L. Frey